

**R E M A R K S**

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

It is respectfully submitted that, even if the Examiner's interpretations of JP 2000-253127 ("Tsuji") and US 2002/0052196 ("Padawer et al") were assumed to be reasonable, the Final Office Action still does not establish that the fair teachings of Tsuji and Padawer et al would teach or suggest all of the limitations recited in the independent claims. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that *prima facie* obviousness of independent claims 1 and 12 and the claims respectively depending therefrom has not been established. See MPEP 2143.03.

More specifically, independent claim 1 recites "first display control means for, when the instruction is issued to display the communication log, causing the display means to display ... a display region for issuing an instruction to display images with the displayed communication log" (emphasis added; see reference numeral 1113 in Fig. 11 with respect to the display region).

Independent claim 1 also recites "second display control means for, when it is determined that at least one of the displayed items of contact address information is associated with one of the items of image data, ... replacing the display region for issuing the instruction to display the images with the

displayed communication log with a display region for issuing an instruction to display the communication log by the first display control means without the images" (emphasis added; see reference numeral 1130 in Fig. 11 with respect to the display region).

Thus, claim 1 recites first display control means for (in particular) displaying a display region for issuing an instruction to display the communication log with images, and claim 1 recites second display control means for, in particular, displaying a display region for issuing an instruction to display the communication log without the images.

The Examiner has not pointed to any structure in either Tsuji or Padawer et al corresponding to these features recited in independent claim 1. Indeed, the Examiner has not specifically addressed these features of claim 1 at all in the Final Office Action.

In fact, at the bottom of page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Tsuji discloses displaying a re-sized image with contact information, but does not disclose displaying contact information without such images. However, the Examiner asserts that not displaying images in the invention of Tsuji is "a mere return to the prior art of display of only the contact information." The Examiner has also cited Padawer et al for the display of only contact information without images (see the top of page 5 of the Office Action).

However, the Examiner has not pointed to any structure in either cited reference that would correspond to first display control means that displays a display region for issuing an instruction to display the communication log with images, or second display control means that displays a display region for issuing an instruction to display the communication log without the images, as recited in independent claim 1.

Indeed, since, as the Examiner appears to acknowledge, neither Tsuji nor Padawer et al discloses switching between displaying a communication log with images and displaying a communication log without images, Tsuji and Padawer et al cannot disclose this structure recited in independent claim 1.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Tsuji and Padawer et al, even if considered together in a manner consistent with the fair teachings thereof, clearly do not disclose, teach or suggest all of the features recited in independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that *prima facie* obviousness of independent claim 1 has not been established, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 1 in view of Tsuji and Padawer be withdrawn.

Independent method claim 12, moreover, recites "displaying, when the instruction is issued to display the communication ... a display region for issuing an instruction to display images with the displayed communication log" (emphasis added). And

independent method claim 12 also recites "when it is determined that at least one of the displayed items of contact address information associated with one of the items of image data, ... replacing the display region for issuing the instruction to display the images with the displayed communication log with a display region for issuing an instruction to display the communication log without the images" (emphasis added).

In manner similar to that explained above with respect to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that Tsuji and Padawer et al, even if considered together in a manner consistent with the fair teachings thereof, also clearly do not disclose, teach or suggest all of the steps recited in independent method claim 12. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that *prima facie* obviousness of independent claim 12 has not been established, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 12 in view of Tsuji and Padawer be withdrawn.

\* \* \* \* \*

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present invention as recited in independent claims 1 and 12, as well as claims 2-11 and 13-20 respectively depending therefrom, clearly patentably distinguishes over of Tsuji and Padawer et al under 35 USC 103.

Entry of this Amendment, allowance of the claims and the passing of this application to issue are respectfully solicited.

If the Examiner has any comments, questions, objections or recommendations, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number given below for prompt action.

Respectfully submitted,

/Douglas Holtz/

Douglas Holtz  
Reg. No. 33,902

Frishauf, Holtz, Goodman & Chick, P.C.  
220 Fifth Avenue - 16<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, New York 10001-7708  
Tel. No. (212) 319-4900  
Fax No. (212) 319-5101

DH:iv:rjl